PostScript

LETTERS

If you have a burning desire to respond to a paper published in *Sex Transm Inf*, why not make use of our ''rapid response'' option?
Log on to our website (www.stijournal.com), find the paper that interests you, click on ''full text'', and send your response by email by clicking on the ''eletters submit a response''.
Providing it isn't libellous or obscene, it will be posted within seven days. You can retrieve it by clicking on ''read eletters'' on our homepage.
The editors will decide, as before, whether to also publish it in a future paper issue.

Diagnosis and exclusion of gonorrhoea in women

The recent report[1] of the death of rectal and throat sampling in women was an exaggeration. I write lest anyone think there has been a conversion from long held,[2 3] and recently reiterated[4 5] views. Bradbeer and Mears questioned the utility of taking rectal and throat swabs in female gonorrhoea contacts by reference to a poster presentation, of which I was a co-author, at the IUSTI Asia-Pacific Conference 2002.[6]

In this poster the conclusion stated that: ''At this clinic rectal microscopy and culture, and throat culture in women did not aid diagnosis. There appears to be a general reduction in the usefulness of these tests since the last major assessment.'' The authors offered one possible explanation (of several) for this but did *not* conclude (as implied by Bradbeer and Mears' citation) that these investigations could be abandoned.

While it is vital that we have sensitive and specific methods for *diagnosing* STIs, including gonorrhoea, we have always, even during the post-war mode of gonococcal incidence, the mid-1970s, spent most of our time *excluding* gonorrhoea. We need to be able to tell, with confidence, those who ask us, that they have *not* got gonorrhoea. Further, we need to be able to reassure those treated that the infection has been eliminated. One conclusion from our study, which we hope to publish after peer review, may well be that the testing protocols adhered to in 2001 were inadequate to exclude gonorrhoea. Their adequacy would not improve were we to abandon samples from rectum and oropharynx.

For the record, the correct citation (their reference 11) and order of authors is as given here.[6] We did not suggest limiting swab sites to the urethra and cervix; the number of rectal investigations was not (as implied) 338, but 115 by culture and 94 by microscopy; throat swabs numbered 119. Finally, we did not see ''338 cases of female contacts of GC.'' The number of female contacts of gonorrhoea seen and reported in our series was 101.

D Barlow
Lydia Department, Department of Genitourinary Medicine, St Thomas's Hospital, London SE1 7EH, UK; david.barlow@gstt.sthames.nhs.uk

doi: 10.1136/sti.2004.009720
Accepted for publication 26 February 2004

References

1 **Bradbeer C**, Mears A. STI services in the United Kingdom: how shall we cope? *Sex Transm Infect* 2003;**79**:435–8.
2 **Barlow D**, Phillips I. Gonorrhoea in women—diagnostic, clinical and therapeutic aspects. *Lancet* 1978;**i**:761–4.
3 **Barlow D**, Ison C. Neisseria gonorrhoeae. In: Weatherall, Ledingham, Warrell, eds. *Oxford textbook of medicine*. 3rd ed, 1995;**1**:544–50.
4 **Barlow D**. Neisseria gonorrhoeae. In: Ledingham, Warrell, eds. *Concise Oxford textbook of medicine* 2000:1599–16.
5 **Barlow D**, Ison C. Neisseria gonorrhoeae infection. In: Warrell, Cox, Firth, eds. *Oxford textbook of medicine*. 4th ed. 2003;**1**:486–9.
6 **Watson J**, Cormack I, Barlow D. Method of diagnosis and sexual behaviour of women with gonorrhoea. Poster presentation. Beijing: IUSTI Asia-Pacific Conference, 2002.

Barriers to HIV testing: a survey of GUM clinic attendees

HIV testing forms an important part of the national strategy for sexual health and HIV of the UK government. It proposes that all genitourinary medicine (GUM) clinic patients who are attending for ''their first screening for sexually transmitted infections''[1] should be offered an HIV test. Previous research has suggested that uptake of HIV testing in antenatal clinics is midwife dependent and possibly doctor dependent within the context of the GUM clinic.[2 3] The aim of this study was to identify factors associated with being offered an HIV test and having an HIV test in an inner city sexual health clinic with a universal HIV testing policy before publication of the government's national strategy for sexual health and HIV.[1]

We conducted a prospective questionnaire based survey of all patients of unknown HIV status presenting over a 2 month period. All patients who saw a doctor, except those attending for follow up, were invited to participate. The main outcome measure was the offer and uptake of HIV testing.

A total of 585 (49.4%) questionnaires were returned. There were no significant differences between responders and non-responders in terms of sex, age, STI, or HIV prevalence; 78.0% of eligible patients reported that they were offered an HIV test. The offering of an HIV test was associated with the patient's ethnicity, intention to test, use of class A/B drugs, and previous STI diagnosis (table 1). This difference remained after controlling for language. No significant difference was observed in patients' intention to have a test according to ethnicity (30.1% for white patients versus 21.0% for non-white patients, $p = 0.103$). The offering of an HIV test was not associated with whether the doctor was in training, routinely conducted an HIV outpatient clinic, or was male or female.

The uptake of HIV testing (42% overall) was associated with an HIV test being offered, partner numbers, having new partners while abroad and/or unprotected sex, and previous STI diagnosis. None of the patient's sociodemographic characteristics considered (including their ethnicity) were significantly associated with HIV testing uptake. Patients for whom English was not their first language were more likely to test than patients whose first language was English ($p = 0.014$). There was no significant difference in uptake according to doctor's training status, or whether they conducted an HIV clinic.

Despite relatively high rates of offering and uptake of HIV testing, there were disparities between different groups within the population. Some of the more vulnerable groups within the community appeared less likely to be offered HIV testing despite having the same uptake if a test was offered. Factors that may contribute to the disparity in offering of HIV tests include the clinician's perception of the patient's risk, prejudice (both on a personal and institutional level) and time constraints of staff. The British Co-operative Clinical Group identified ''lack of time'' as the most common reason that HIV testing was not offered.[4] With increasing numbers of healthcare practitioners becoming involved in sexual health care, appropriate standards of practice need to be maintained to ensure equity of access to HIV testing.

Acknowledgements

We thank R French and R Power for help with design of the questionnaire. The authors acknowledge with considerable gratitude the efforts of staff at Archway Sexual Health Clinic for their enthusiasm in implementing this study.

F Burns, C H Mercer, D Mercey, S T Sadiq
Centre for Sexual Health and HIV Research, Royal Free and University College Medical School, UCL, London, UK

B Curran, P Kell
Archway Sexual Health Clinic, Camden Primary Care Trust, London, UK

Correspondence to: Dr F Burns, Mortimer Market Centre, Off Capper Street, London WC1E 6AU, UK; fburns@gum.ucl.ac.uk

doi: 10.1136/sti.2003.007682
Accepted for publication 26 February 2004

Sources of support: Funding for data entry from Archway Sexual Health Clinic.

Conflict of interest: none.

References

1 **Department of Health**. *The national strategy for sexual health and HIV*. London: DoH, 2001.
2 **Jones S**, Sadler T, Low N, *et al*. Does uptake of antenatal HIV testing depend on the individual midwife? Cross sectional study. *BMJ* 1998;**316**:272–3.
3 **Griffiths M**, Stockdale H, Winter AJ, *et al*. Uptake of HIV testing in a genitourinary medicine clinic is affected by individual doctors. *Sex Transm Infect* 2001;**77**:143–4.
4 **British Co-operative Clinical Group**. Screening for HIV infection in genitourinary medicine clinics: a lost opportunity? *Sex Transm Infect* 2000;**76**:307–10.

Table 1 Variations in reporting of being offered an HIV test and HIV test uptake*

Patient characteristics	Reported being offered an HIV test			Offered a test and having an HIV test		
	n/N†	(%)	p Value	n/N†	(%)	p Value
All patients	327/419	(78.0)	–	160/319	(50.2)	–
Sociodemographics						
Sex			0.387			0.613
Male	138/170	(81.2)		66/133	(49.6)	
Female	187/245	(76.3)		94/184	(51.1)	
Ethnicity			0.005			0.372
White	186/223	(83.4)		93/181	(51.4)	
Not white	136/189	(72.0)		65/133	(48.9)	
Among non-white patients:			*0.073*			*0.283*
Black Caribbean	*63/82*	*(76.8)*		*28/61*	*(45.9)*	
Black African	*15/20*	*(75.0)*		*9/15*	*(60.0)*	
Black British	*29/40*	*(72.5)*		*11/28*	*(39.3)*	
Asian	*6/9*	*(66.7)*		*2/6*	*(33.3)*	
Other ethnicity	*23/38*	*(60.5)*		*15/23*	*(65.2)*	
English is first language			0.360			0.014
Yes	280/353	(79.3)		129/274	(47.1)	
No	43/59	(72.9)		29/41	(70.7)	
Sexuality			0.497			0.060
Heterosexual	293/378	(77.5)		148/286	(51.7)	
Homosexual/bisexual	29/34	(85.3)		9/28	(32.1)	
Sexual behaviour						
Number of heterosexual partners, past year			0.667			<0.001
0/1	114/147	(77.6)		43/113	(38.1)	
2+	184/227	(81.1)		108/181	(59.7)	
Number of homosexual partners, past year			0.586			0.151
0/1	93/117	(79.5)		46/91	(50.5)	
2+	19/25	(76.0)		6/19	(31.6)	
New partner(s) while abroad in past 5 years			0.152			0.097
No	156/205	(76.1)		70/154	(45.5)	
Yes	82/99	(82.8)		48/82	(58.5)	
Unprotected vaginal sex with 2+partners in past year			0.847			0.002
No	162/210	(77.1)		72/161	(44.7)	
Yes	122/156	(78.2)		74/120	(61.7)	
Unprotected anal sex with 2+partners in past year‡			0.729			0.103
No	172/228	(75.4)		83/170	(48.8)	
Yes	13/18	(72.2)		9/11	(81.8)	
GUM clinic history						
Previous STI diagnosis			0.029			0.007
No	180/218	(82.6)		100/177	(56.5)	
Yes	112/157	(71.3)		44/112	(39.3)	
Last HIV test			0.207			0.093
1–5 years ago	77/97	(79.4)		47/76	(61.8)	
More than 5 years ago	18/24	(75.0)		6/18	(33.3)	
Never	226/291	(77.7)		104/220	(47.3)	
Intention to have an HIV test			<0.001			<0.001
No, not intention/don't know	231/314	(73.6)		70/225	(31.1)	
Yes, intention	95/103	(92.2)		90/93	(96.8)	
Clinician seen for consultation						
Clinician's training status§¶			0.079			0.536
Completed training	103/143	(72.0)		50/99	(50.5)	
In training	96/115	(83.5)		56/96	(58.3)	
Clinician's sex§			0.392			0.082
Male	88/119	(73.9)		46/86	(53.5)	
Female	107/132	(81.1)		60/105	(57.1)	
Clinician also runs an HIV clinic§			0.684			0.770
No	121/158	(76.6)		64/118	(54.2)	
Yes	74/93	(79.6)		42/73	(57.5)	
Drug use						
Used cocaine/heroin/speed/ecstasy/LSD in past year			0.028			0.722
No	202/270	(74.8)		99/200	(49.5)	
Yes	105/121	(86.8)		53/103	(51.5)	

*Patients who reported an HIV risk in the past 3 months, an HIV test in the past year, or that their reason for not testing was that they had tested recently, were excluded from the analysis. This was to ensure that only individuals in whom HIV testing would be unequivocally appropriate in terms of risks and resources were included in our analysis.
†Base (N) excludes patients who did not report a valid response (''yes'', ''no,'' ''don't know'') to whether or not they had been offered an HIV test, as well as item non-response.
‡Heterosexual and/or homosexual anal sex.
§Base (N) excludes 151 patients for whom data on their clinician's characteristics could not be obtained, in addition to 25 patients who did not report whether or not they had been offered an HIV test and whether or not they were having an HIV test, as well as item non-response.
¶Consultants and clinical assistants are considered as those who had completed their training, while specialist registrars, senior house officers, and gynaecological staff are considered as being in training.